



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tal growth of the child is the parent, because he focuses and transmits these. The family, in a special sense, is and must always be the center of true education. If the family is safe and sound, the state is safe and sound. And when owing to social necessities, a class of the community is set apart to do the work of the family, that class must be in every sense *in loco parentis*:—that is to say, the aims, materials, and methods of the school must be those of a humane and enlightened parent, and the influence of the school must be, as much as possible, a continuation and extension of the family conception of education, rather than a substitute for it. If this single idea is accepted, the deductions from it will be found to be numerous and significant.

(*To be continued.*)

S. S. Laurie.

University of Edinburgh.

LATIN IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL.

The educational world has been busily engaged in recent years in "taking account of stock." The various studies and methods employed for purposes of instruction and discipline have been taken down from the shelves, so to speak, and subjected to fresh inspection, with the object of determining whether they still possess a market value. In this process it has been the ancient classics whose worth has been chiefly called in question. From various quarters and with varying degrees of logic and vehemence these time-honored studies have repeatedly been arraigned. While the attack has been directed mainly against the classics as college studies, and more particularly against Greek than Latin, yet Latin has been, and still is, the object of fierce assault, not only as a part of the college curriculum, but as a study of the secondary schools as well. It is on this latter subject—Latin in the secondary school—that I shall venture to make a few observations touching its claims and the methods by which it may be made an efficient instrument of discipline and culture. The discussion, therefore, is not a general discussion of the utility of the classics, nor is it a consideration of the claims or position of Latin in the college or university. This caution seems necessary at the outset, since many persons, when one of the classical languages is men-

tioned, are unable to dissociate it from the other. I well remember an occasion when I had been making a somewhat lengthy and elaborate plea in behalf of Latin in the grammar school, that a leading educator who joined in the discussion, took me to task for proposing to teach *Latin and Greek* to children of tender age. My only surprise is that he had not added Hebrew and Sanskrit to the indictment. To guard against misapprehension therefore, let it be clearly understood that the present paper proposes to deal with Latin exclusively, and with Latin in the secondary school,—not in the college.

To begin with, it seems to me that the fundamental purpose of Latin in the secondary school is often overlooked by the opponents of the study. Some of these assume that this purpose is the acquisition of the ability to read or speak the Latin language, and very properly deny the utility of either of these accomplishments for the great mass of pupils in our secondary schools. Others fancy the aim is to familiarize the pupil more intimately with the history of the past, and though conceding to this a certain value they are nevertheless constrained to deny that the result is commensurate with the expenditure of time and energy involved in its attainment. Yet others hold that Latin should be studied because it leaves behind it a certain impalpable, indefinable deposit of culture. All of these objects—except perhaps learning to speak Latin—are properly included in the purposes of Latin teaching, but they are not the main object. If they were, and if no other and no larger results might be expected from Latin study in our schools, than those just mentioned, I for one should be inclined to join the opponents of Latin in questioning its utility for the great body of students of the secondary education. I should still defend its retention for the benefit of those who are seeking preparation for the classical courses in our colleges, but I should not dare maintain, as I now do, that Latin is of the greatest value for all pupils in the secondary school, whether they are intending to go to college or not.

What then is the purpose of Latin study at this stage of education? As its prime object I should unhesitatingly put training in the mother tongue,—*i. e.*, for us Americans, training in English. As to the desirability of such training, educators are at present speaking with no uncertain voice. Our educational conventions and periodicals are full of the subject, college presidents

vie with each other in emphasizing its importance, the press has taken up the cry,—from all quarters comes the demand for better training in English. Taken with all it implies and involves, this demand really embraces all there is of education. An educated man is the man who is master of his native speech; and when a distinguished college president declares it to be the purpose of the institution of which he is the head, to teach young men to write and speak good English, we must admit that, in the highest and best sense, that is the object of all education—of school and college alike. At least no one may claim to be educated who is not master of the resources of his mother tongue, for the purpose of oral and written expression,—who cannot use it with clearness, vigor, and effect. As regards the advantage of such a mastery, there will obviously be no difference of opinion. The question is: How does Latin study contribute to that end? Simply by the minute and searching study it constantly involves of English words and phrases,—*i. e.*, of the instruments of English thought. From the beginning of Latin study translation from Latin into English becomes a daily exercise. Now this process is far from being the purely mechanical one which many assume. It is true that the pupil is furnished with a vocabulary which supplies him with the meanings of the Latin word. But it is seldom that the Latin and the English word are co-extensive in meaning; the vocabulary gives six, eight, or ten synonymous expressions, between which a choice must be made. The simplest Latin sentence thus often raises puzzling questions to the pupil who is seeking its most perfect rendering. One word or phrase is clearer, more precise, more elegant than another. To choose wisely the pupil must compare the different forms of expression suggested; he must weigh and study them, often consulting his English dictionary or other sources. When he has canvassed the field and made his choice, he is ready to give his English rendering of the Latin.

To some all this seems merely a triumph of ingenuity, as though in determining the meaning of the passage the pupil had simply solved a puzzle, as it were. That is only a part—and the least significant part—of the process. The pupil has not merely determined the meaning of the sentence or passage, but he has put this meaning in an English form. In doing this he has incidentally gained new light on the meaning of English words.

Words that before expressed to him the same general—possibly somewhat vague—notion, now stand out with clearly defined differences. Instead of being identical in scope and content, they are seen to represent, it may be, parts of a greater whole, or possibly different phases of the same idea—one the subjective, the other the objective, one the concrete, the other the abstract,—in short the pupil is initiated into the process of discriminating, of drawing fine distinctions between closely related conceptions and alternative forms of expression. It is precisely this which gives one the capacity to wield one's vernacular with skill and power, and which marks the educated man from the uneducated.

Nor is it merely an exercise in discrimination in the use of single words that the study of Latin affords. Often the *method of expression* of a complex Latin thought differs radically from the English idiom. The Latin sentence structure is periodic, involving clause after clause in an order and in relations which are unfamiliar to the English mind. Here again the pupil finds scope for attaining skill in English expression. It is not merely a question of finding subject and predicate, but of finding an exact equivalent, *in idiomatic English*, of the Latin. The long periodic sentence must be broken up; subordinate clauses must be turned into principal ones; ablatives absolute must be converted into clauses introduced by appropriate conjunctions, and the different parts of the sentence so arranged as to bring out with distinctness in English the thought-perspective of the Latin. This task is seldom easy; often it is very severe. It necessitates careful tests at each stage of the work, and not infrequently repeated trials and awkward failures are a necessary preliminary to a rendering which shall do justice to the Latin original. Yet all this time the pupil is undergoing wholesome discipline in composition and style. In casting about for the best rendering of his Latin sentence, he sees that one form lacks clearness, another simplicity; yet another destroys the perspective, giving undue emphasis to what is trivial, or failing to accent what is important. Finally, by successive trials he arrives at the order and arrangement which best represents the meaning of the Latin sentence in all its complex relationships.

The advantages of such discipline as I have just been describing over the usual forms of composition in English are, at the particular stage of education of which we are speaking, great and

obvious. Original composition must necessarily deal only with the ideas already present in the pupil's mind. How elementary and crude these are in case of the pupils in our secondary schools, is a fact sufficiently familiar to us all. The reflective period has not usually begun at the age when the pupil enters upon the secondary education; he finds it difficult to write an English theme because he has nothing to write about. But set before him a passage of Latin, elevated in thought and well expressed, with the problem of putting this in the best English he can command. In the first place he is relieved of the necessity of hunting aimlessly about for ideas which do not exist in his brain; and in the second place he is raised above the plane of his ordinary thinking, and in this higher atmosphere grows familiar with concepts and ideas which might otherwise long remain foreign or at least vague to him. All things considered I do not hesitate to say that I believe there is a considerable period in the earlier portion of the secondary training when Latin translation, if rightly conducted, may wisely be made practically the exclusive instrument of special instruction in English composition.

It is, of course, manifest that the foregoing argument, if valid, applies equally to other languages than Latin, and many will doubtless be inclined to advocate the advantages of French or German, as superior to those of Latin. While not denying the usefulness of both these languages when taught with discrimination, yet I see two reasons for giving Latin a decided preference to either. In the first place the concepts and ideas of the Latin language are much remoter from those of English than are those of the modern languages. All modern thought is essentially kindred. The same intellectual elements, so to speak, are common to all civilized nations,—particularly to nations so closely in touch as the English, French, and German. This is not true when we come to study either of the ancient languages. The ultimate elements of the thought—*i. e.*, the language—of the Greeks and Romans are as different from ours as is their entire civilization. It is precisely this fundamental difference which makes either of the classical languages of such invaluable discipline. At every stage of the study we are brought in contact with new phases of thought, new ideas; the intellectual horizon is continually widening. The modern languages, on the other hand, sug-

gest relatively much less that is new. Both the matter, and the manner of expression are so directly in the line of our ordinary knowledge and speech, as to give much less occasion to processes of comparison or to that stimulating intellectual grapple which is essential to mental growth. This is particularly true of French, whose thought-forms are so closely kindred to our own. It is less true of German, though even that language suggests vastly fewer differences in ideas,—and consequently vastly fewer opportunities for comparison—than do either Greek or Latin.

There is yet another reason which I should urge in favor of Latin, and that is that Latin has supplied us with so large a share of our own vocabulary. Just what the exact percentage of such words in English is, I do not know. Nor is it material. The number at any rate is very large, and covers every department of thought. For this reason no educated person can safely undertake to dispense with a knowledge of the root words of the Latin language. I mean no such knowledge as comes from memorizing a list of the commoner roots and suffixes along with their meanings, but a knowledge at first hand, and sufficiently comprehensive and thorough to enable one to feel the full significance of the primary words of the Latin. It is on these two grounds—one essentially disciplinary, the other essentially practical—that I would base a preference for Latin, as compared with Greek on the one hand, and with either French or German on the other. This preference, of course, by no means implies that one or more of the other languages just mentioned may not wisely be added to Latin in the secondary school. I most certainly think that this should be done wherever practicable, and would advocate the combination of two languages, as, for example, Latin and Greek, Latin and German, or Latin and French. Latin, however, I should insist upon *as the basal study for all pupils* of the secondary school. More than two languages (Latin for four years, and Greek, German, or French for three years) I should not suggest for an individual pupil, though I am well aware that the colleges are enforcing demands in this direction. With all the advantages and allurements of language study I believe we can easily go too far, and may do damage by neglecting other sides of the pupil's intellect.

I have enlarged sufficiently upon what seems to me the primary end of Latin study in the secondary school, *viz.*, the supe-

rior facilities it offers for training in English. There is yet another humanizing influence of the study, which though of less importance, must not be ignored. I refer to the sympathetic knowledge of Roman history, thought, and institutions which comes from the study of Latin. No one can get so good a view of the personality of that great organizer, Julius Caesar, as the intelligent reader of Caesar's own narrative; no one can so appreciate the constitution and workings of the Roman Republic, as the pupil who reads Cicero's *Orations* or *Letters*; no one can so appreciate the one dominant principle of all Roman civilization—the consciousness of imperial destiny—as he who comes face to face with that sentiment in the more inspiring passages of the *Aeneid*. These are merely examples of the almost infinite suggestiveness of Latin study along historical lines,—not that the study of Latin can or should replace a formal study of Roman history, but it can and should be used to supplement and illuminate it.

I shall not venture to dwell upon the specifically literary training which comes to every mind of ordinary endowment by contact with the masterpieces of Latin writing usually read in our secondary schools; but I shall assume that such influences are exerted by the study, and that they will be regarded as legitimate and valuable ends of public education.

Assuming that the purposes of Latin study in the secondary school are those already indicated, *viz.*, training in English, the better comprehension of the history of Roman thought and institutions, the quickening of the higher literary sense, we shall easily draw certain conclusions as to the fundamental principles of Latin teaching. I have no special scheme to advocate, but wish simply to call attention to one or two important particulars, in which it seems to me there is often neglect of duty on the part of teachers—frequently to the great and, under the circumstances, deserved discredit of Latin as an educational influence.

To begin with, if Latin is to be a means of training in English, the form of the English translation becomes a matter of the first importance. It is not enough for the pupil to grasp the idea, and then to render it in a mongrel idiom half Latin and half English. From the very outset of Latin study the standard should be set high, and no translation accepted which will not stand the severest test as to the orthodoxy of its English. It

should not merely be idiomatic ; it should possess the merits and even the graces of style. Wherever a rendering is unnatural and smacks of the original, a halt should be called, and improvement demanded. I believe I am not extreme when I insist that no translation should ever be accepted which would not, when written out, be accepted as good "copy" for a published translation of the author in whom it occurs. If the pupil is not capable of this, it must be either because he does not understand the passage to be rendered, or else because he cannot express in English a thought which his mind clearly apprehends. Either of these difficulties, if it exist, admits of remedy by judicious instruction. Such instruction may be slow,—both at the outset and often afterwards,—for it involves frequent discussion as to the choice of words and sentence structure ; but precisely herein lies the advantage of the study. I am well aware of the pressure for time, and can appreciate the temptation of the teacher to accept any rendering of a passage, however un-English, provided it indicates that the pupil apprehends the thought. But I insist that there is no falser economy than a surrender under such circumstances. Compromises of this sort not only do not save time in the long run, but they ignore the very principle and purpose of Latin study, and ought to make that study stand in even less respect among the general public than it actually does to-day.

Yet I am convinced that the habit of ignoring the form of translation, provided the pupil gets the sense, is practically epidemic. More than this, the custom is even defended. I know of teachers who soberly maintain their preference for a perfectly literal translation on the ground that such a rendering facilitates the teaching of Latin syntax. This attitude, I think, gives us the key to the prevailing methods of translation from Latin into English. Grammatical knowledge is often made the end of Latin study instead of a means. Grammar is undoubtedly indispensable to the reading of Latin authors ; but is it not a fact that many teachers stop at this point of the subject, and rest content, if their pupils can dispose successfully of the ablatives and genitives, the subjunctives and infinitives ? Is not "construction" made the culmination of the study, and the text used as though it were but a convenient lay-figure upon which to drape in imposing folds the robe of grammar and syntax ? I am convinced that there are many teachers whose attitude and practice are not misrepresented

by this comparison. My own view is that in reading an author the amount of grammatical catechizing should be reduced to a minimum; let only so much be demanded as is absolutely necessary to the proper understanding of the text. Let all the effort be directed to the most discriminating interpretation of the passage in hand as language and literature. Let the study be an ethical and spiritual one; let the pupil feel when he approaches it that he is to receive each day some fresh revelation of the nature of mind and its workings. As to formal drill in syntax, let that be separated from the reading of texts. I know no better plan than that advocated by Mr. Collar, *viz.*, to teach grammar through the medium of Latin writing. No more rational way than this can be suggested,—and, I believe, no more effective one.

I shall venture to mention one other cause (beside grammar-worship) which seems to me responsible for much of the prevalent carelessness in the matter of translation. This cause is a misconception of what is meant by "reading at sight." Real reading at sight is exactly what its name implies. It is the reading *without translation* of what the pupil can easily and directly apprehend as a result of his present knowledge of the language. For this purpose only the very simplest Latin can ever be used in the secondary school. The pupil who has already learned to prepare his daily translation in Cicero with some facility, is no more than ready to attempt to read at sight the simplest sentences of Eutropius or *Viri Romae*. Such an exercise, consisting primarily of an intelligent oral reading of the Latin, is a most valuable help in cultivating a feeling for Latin form and style, and should be practiced wherever time allows. But the habit, which has become prevalent among us, of endeavoring to gallop over large amounts of Latin which the pupil cannot readily apprehend, not only possesses no advantages,—it is positively demoralizing. The only way to learn to read Latin at sight is to learn to read it first by the slower processes of carefully prepared translation, and patiently to await the time when the mind can apprehend simple Latin with ease. It will be impossible to hasten the advent of this capacity by attempting to force matters. It will come all the sooner by moving slowly at the outset and for a long time afterwards.

It must be confessed that those colleges which prescribe and enforce translation at sight as an admission test, are partially

responsible for much of the misdirected energy in the way of "reading at sight" in the schools. While nominally assuming to require only "an ability to translate at sight passages of average difficulty," the colleges in reality often set passages to which only an expert could fairly do justice. It is this practice, I believe, which has stimulated the schools to attempt the reading at sight of much more difficult Latin than can be fairly mastered without serious and protracted study. The result in many cases is that valuable time is wasted in striving, by rapid superficial reading of large amounts, to attain a command of the language which can come only as the result of a continued application of minuter methods of study.

I subjoin the following as a specimen of the reckless style of translation which seems to me is largely attributable to such methods as I have just been criticizing. It was presented at Cornell University in September, 1892, by a graduate of a secondary school who was the applicant for a freshman scholarship. As these scholarships are assigned after a rigid competitive examination, at which only the better equipped students are accustomed to apply, it will be seen that the applicant was one who had been led to believe in the efficiency of his previous preparation. As a convenience I append the Latin which was set for translation,—a simple extract from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* :

At Phaëthon, rutilos flamma populante capillos,
 Volvitur in praeceps, longoque per aëra tractu
 Fertur, ut interdum de caelo stella sereno
 Etsi non cecidit, potuit cecidisse videri.
 Quem procul a patria diverso maximus orbe
 Excipit Eridanus, fumantiaque abluit ora.
 Naïdes Hesperiae trifida fumantia flamma
 Corpora dant tumulo, signant quoque carmine saxum :
 HIC-SITUS-EST-PHAETHON-CURRUS-AURIGA-PATERNI
 QUEM-SI-NON-TENUIT-MAGNIS-TAMEN-EXCIDIT-AUSIS
 Nam pater obductos, luctu miserabilis aegro,
 Condiderat vultus ; et, si modo credimus, unum
 Isse diem sine sole ferunt. Incendia lumen
 Praebant, aliquisque malo fuit usus in illo.

The translation follows :

"But Phaëthon, the soft beards being filled with flame, is

turned headlong and far through the ethereal waste is borne, just as the stars in the peaceful heavens, although he yielded not, it was able to be seen that he should have yielded. Whom formerly the great Eridanus taken out from his native land to a strange city and washed his bloody countenance. The Naiades, Hesperiae gave the thrice faithful bloody bodies to the mound, and then they marked the rock in blood. Here is the site of the Phaëthon course the charioteer of the paternal land whom if he could not hold greatly nevertheless—he was cut to pieces—he dared.

For the father being led away miserable in aged desire, he had composed his countenance, and if we believe in the manner, they bear one day without the sun! The burning light is fed and other use was in that bad."

Would any pupil who had not often been encouraged to ambitious attacks upon impregnable linguistic strongholds, have ever been guilty of anything so atrocious as the foregoing? Any one who had read with fidelity the Latin authors commonly studied in preparation for college, ought certainly to have been able to render with credit the passage above given. But reckless excursions in the field of translating at sight will unfit any mind for exact habits of thought, and are likely to work just such mental havoc as seen above.

As regards the subject-matter of authors read, I believe our secondary schools quite generally make one very serious omission. They fail to emphasize the importance of grasping the narrative or argument of a writer in its continuity. The tendency is to read simply from day to day. Too little effort—often none at all—is made to bring successive lessons into relation, to show the bearings and connection of the different parts of a narrative or speech. How few pupils, after reading a book of Caesar or an oration of Cicero, have in their minds any clear and consistent picture of the course of thought, the line of argument, its strength and defects, or apprehend the real drift of the piece as a whole! Is not the piece commonly made a succession of "takes," the order of which might be varied *ad libitum*, so far as concerns interference with any systematic endeavor to show their organic connection? And is not the impression left upon the minds of pupils often one of utter vagueness as to what it is all about? I believe the alleged defect to be very general, and if

it is, it surely ought to be remedied at once. I know of no surer way to kill all literary sense and encourage mechanical formalism, than the exclusive employment of the analytic method of study, without ever a thought of synthesis,—always taking apart,—never putting together. Such a process is *destructive* in more senses than one. Let us not abandon analysis in our study of Latin, but let us combine with it a larger use of synthetic methods. After a pupil has translated a book of Caesar or an oration of Cicero, let him under the teacher's guidance go carefully over the whole; let him build up thought on thought, until he comes to see and feel the piece as a unit. I believe that reform in this particular is widely needed in the schools where Latin is taught. The ancient languages are held to be instruments of culture; and so they are when rightly used. But culture implies the apprehension of things in their relations. It is not merely a familiarity with "the best that has been thought and said." If it were, the *Dictionary of Familiar Quotations* would be the place to find it. Let us bear this in mind as we teach the Latin classics; let us remember that they are not merely languages, but—what is much more—literature.

The friends of Latin should soberly consider that the study is now on trial as never before. The attacks against it are not merely reactionary, nor do they proceed alone from the prejudiced or the ill-informed. They represent in many instances the deliberate convictions of serious students of the problems of education,—convictions which it is idle to ignore. If the study is to retain its position as a permanent part of the school curriculum, it can do so only by the positive results it shows itself capable of producing. Whether these shall commend themselves to educators will depend, not upon any theoretical claims or advantages of the study, but upon wise and efficient methods of instruction.

Chas. E. Bennett.

Cornell University.